UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/079,606	02/21/2002	Jean Tourrilhes	100111716-1	7283

7590 09/07/2005

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
LY, NGHI H	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2686	

DATE MAILED: 09/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/079,606	TOURRILHES, JEAN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nghi H. Ly	2686	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 February 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *22 February 2005* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings were received on 02/22/2005. These drawings (Fig.2) are **not** acceptable.

Fig.2, the link between box 21 and box 22 is missing.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-6 and 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell (US 6,405,027) in view of Mitzutani et al (US 6,603,744).

Regarding claims 1 and 8, Bell teaches a system for changing operation mode (see column 5, lines 18-28) of a first communication interface of a first device in communication with a second device (see fig.1a, communication devices Do, D2 and Dn). Bell does not specifically disclose a communication activator external to the first device to send a trigger signal when an external third device wants to communicate with the first device via the first interface, a second communication interface inside the first device to receive the trigger signal, an operation mode control module coupled to the first and second interfaces to cause the first interface to change its operation mode in order to communicate with the third device when the second interface receives the

trigger signal.

Mitzutani teaches a communication activator external to the first device to send a trigger signal when an external third device wants to communicate with the first device via the first interface (see column 4, lines 19-39 and fig.8, box 59 or 60 reads on Applicant's "an external third device"), a second communication interface inside the first device to receive the trigger signal (see column 16, lines 17-43 and column 20, lines 8-9, see "the wireless port 5... it maybe installed inside the device 7"), an operation mode control module coupled to the first and second interfaces to cause the first interface to change its operation mode in order to communicate with the third device when the second interface receives the trigger signal (see column 5, lines 51-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Mitzutani into the system of Bell in order to provide a mechanism for enabling inter-host communication.

Regarding claims 2 and 9, Bell teaches a system for changing operation mode (see column 5, lines 18-28) of a first communication interface of a first device in communication with a second device (see fig.1a, communication devices Do, D2 and Dn). Bell does not specifically disclose the communication activator is inside the third device that also includes a first communication interface and a second communication interface, wherein the communication activator sends the trigger signal through the second communication interface of the third device.

Mitzutani teaches the communication activator is inside the third device that also includes a first communication interface and a second communication interface, wherein

the communication activator sends the trigger signal through the second communication interface of the third device (see Mitzutani column 20, lines 8-9, see "the wireless port 5... it maybe installed inside the device 7").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Mitzutani into the system of Bell in order to provide a mechanism for enabling inter-host communication.

Regarding claims 3 and 10, Bell teaches a system for changing operation mode (see column 5, lines 18-28) of a first communication interface of a first device in communication with a second device (see fig.1a, communication devices Do, D2 and Dn). Bell does not specifically disclose the communication activator is located external to the third device.

Mitzutani teaches the communication activator is located external to the third device (fig.8, box 59 or 60 is located external).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Mitzutani into the system of Bell in order to provide a mechanism for enabling inter-host communication.

Regarding claims 4 and 11, Bell teaches a system for changing operation mode (see column 5, lines 18-28) of a first communication interface of a first device in communication with a second device (see fig.1a, communication devices Do, D2 and Dn). Bell does not specifically disclose the operation mode of the first interface of the first device is changed to (1) suspend its current exclusive communication with the

second device and (2) include the third device in its communication such that the first, second, and third devices are in communication together.

Mitzutani teaches the operation mode of the first interface of the first device is changed to (1) suspend its current exclusive communication with the second device and (2) include the third device in its communication such that the first, second, and third devices are in communication together (see column 5, lines 35-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Mitzutani into the system of Bell in order to provide a mechanism for enabling inter-host communication.

Regarding claims 5 and 12, Bell teaches a system for changing operation mode (see column 5, lines 18-28) of a first communication interface of a first device in communication with a second device (see fig.1a, communication devices Do, D2 and Dn). Bell does not specifically disclose the operation mode of the first interface of the first device is changed to (1) suspend its current communication with the second device and (2) establish communication with the third device.

Mitzutani teaches the operation mode of the first interface of the first device is changed to (1) suspend its current communication with the second device and (2) establish communication with the third device (see column 5, lines 35-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Mitzutani into the system of Bell in order to provide a mechanism for enabling inter-host communication.

Regarding claims 6 and 13, Bell further teaches the first and second communication interfaces employ different wireless communication technologies (see fig.1a, RF connection between Do and base station 12 and Abstract, see bluetooth).

4. Claims 7 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bell (US 6,405,027) in view of Mitzutani et al (US 6,603,744) and further in view of Cohen et al (US 6,797,519).

Regarding claims 7 and 14, the combination of Bell and Mitzutani teaches short range radio frequency communication technology and long range radio frequency communication technology (see Bell, fig.1a, RF connection between Do and base station 12 and Abstract, see bluetooth). The combination of Bell and Mitzutani does not specifically disclose each of the first and second communication interfaces employs a wireless communication technology selected from a group comprising infrared communication technology, laser communication technology.

Cohen teaches each of the first and second communication interfaces employs a wireless communication technology selected from a group comprising infrared communication technology, laser communication technology column 4, line 49 to column 5, line10).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Cohen into the system of Bell and Mitzutani in order to provide a suitable operating system that may be communicatively couple to the network.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 02/22/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On pages 2-4 of applicant's remarks, applicant argues that neither Bell nor Mitzutani teaches applicant's claimed invention.

In response, the combination of Bell, Mitzutani and Cohen does indeed teach claims 1-3, 5-10 and 12-14. In addition, applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-10 and 12-14 above.

On page 3 of applicant's remarks, applicant argues that Bell does not teach "first communication interface of a first device" and "second communication interface that is inside the first device" as claimed.

In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In this case, Mitzutani (not Bell) teaches the above claimed limitations, and the combination of Bell and Mitzutani teaches applicant's claimed invention (In addition, see Mitzutani, column 20, lines 8-9, see "the wireless port 5... it maybe installed inside the device 7").

On page 3 of applicant's remarks, applicant argues that Mizutani does not teach

communications between more than two devices due to the nature of the type of problem that Mizutani is attempting to solve.

The examiner, however, disagrees. Mizutani does indeed teach communications between more than two devices (see Mizutani, column 20, line 5, see "but more than one device 7 can be connected").

On page 3 of applicant's remarks, applicant further argues that Mizutani does not teach "a communication activator external to the first device to send a trigger signal when an external third device wants to communicate with the first device via the first interface." and " a second communication interface inside the first device to receive the trigger signal" refers to "the trigger signal" and "... when an external third device wants to communicate..." Therefore, Mizutani cannot teach or suggest "a second communication interface inside the first device to receive the trigger signal" and "a commtmication activator external to the first device to send a trigger signal when an external third device wants to communicate with the first device via the first interface".

In response, Mizutani does indeed teach "a communication activator external to the first device to send a trigger signal when an external third device wants to communicate with the first device via the first interface" (see column 4, lines 19-39 see "connection request" and fig.8, box 59 or 60 reads on Applicant's "an external third device") and "a second communication interface inside the first device to receive the trigger signal" (see column 16, lines 17-43 and column 20, lines 8-9, see "the wireless port 5... it maybe installed inside the device 7") refers to "the trigger signal" (see column 4, lines 19-39, see "connection request") and "... when an external third device wants to

communicate..." (column 4, lines 19-39, see "connection request") and Mizutani teach "a second communication interface inside the first device to receive the trigger signal" (column 20, lines 8-9, see "the wireless port 5... it maybe installed inside the device 7") and "a communication activator external to the first device to send a trigger signal when an external third device wants to communicate with the first device via the first interface" (see fig.8, box 59 or 60 reads on Applicant's "an external third device". In addition, column 20, lines 8-9, see "the wireless port 5 is provides outside the device 7).

On page 4 of applicant's remarks, applicant further argues that Mizutani does not teach "external third device".

In response, Mizutani does indeed teach external third device (see column 20, line 5, see "but more than one device 7 can be connected" reads on applicant's "external third device" and column 20, lines 8-9, see "the wireless port 5 is provides outside the device 7" reads on applicant's "external third device").

On page 4 of applicant's remarks, applicant further argues that Mizutani does not teach or suggest "an operation mode control module coupled to the first and second interfaces to cause the first interface to change its operation mode in order to communicate with the third device when the second interface receives the trigger signal".

In response, Mizutani does indeed teach applicant's claimed limitation (column 7, lines 56-60, see "control unit B 25" and see fig.1, control unit B 25 is connected between interface 27 and wireless transceiver 23, and see column 20, line 5, see "but more than one device 7 can be connected" reads on applicant's " third device").

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nghi H. Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-7911. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am-5:30 pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on (571) 272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nghi H. Ly

08/29/05

Marsha D Banks-Harold

MARSHA D. BANKS-HAROLD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600